



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

twice yearly. There remain as possible integers 11, 13, 17, and 19, each of them exhausting a large number of indices and leaving as a residue a varying number of indices which must be repeated in any given solar year.

Here the calendrists were brought face to face with a dilemma. They must choose between a numeral such as 11, which left a large number (145) of duplicate indices in the year, and a numeral such as 17 which, though permitting but few duplicate indices during the year (25), yet, because of its high numerical value, must have involved considerable difficulty in writing and reading. For it must be borne in mind that no system of numerical orthography had been evolved for the writing of dates, and that to write the number 17 required drawing laboriously seventeen circles. Is it too much to suggest that the number 13 was adopted as a mean between the equivocal 11 and the laborious 17?

Again, let us suppose that Aztec custom required or preferred that the year begin and end with the same date, as it actually did. The only one of the three numbers is 13, indeed the only one of the higher numbers besides 7 and 14 which will secure this end. This may well have been a causative factor rather than a secondary result, as already suggested by Dr. Waterman (p. 313). It is interesting to note that our calendar attains the same result by the use of one of the above-named alternate integers, namely 7, so that our year normally begins and ends on the same day of the week.

This seems to me to be a more rational explanation for the existence of the element thirteen in the Aztec *tonalamatl*, not that it is derived from intricate astronomical observations, nor from religious custom, nor yet from the addition of ears and noses, but merely that it is the number which most satisfactorily fulfills the requirements for the practical purpose to which it was put, the distinction of dates. Nor is it necessary to assume that some Aztec Gregory figured it out as we have done; in the course of time, through natural observation and correction, the exact combination most satisfactory to the case must eventually have been evolved.

J. ALDEN MASON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

DR. SPECK'S "THE FAMILY HUNTING BAND"¹

I SHOULD like to discuss a few points raised by Dr. F. G. Speck's paper in a recent number of the *Anthropologist*, called "The Family Hunting Band as the Basis of Algonkin Social Organization." In dealing with

¹ The *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 17, pp. 289-305.

tribes who have been as long subject to European contact as the Micmac, Malecite, and Penobscot we must always face the fact that the information which we obtain is at its best very uncertain; therefore it is not surprising that Dr. Speck did not find out what often takes more of the qualifications of a detective than of a trained ethnologist. What is surprising is that one of Dr. Speck's experience should state so categorically that the Micmac had a social system which was radically different from the Penobscot social system. Now I do not approve of such a loose use of the term totemism which will include the Penobscot system; still if we care to apply that name to the Penobscot system we must apply it to the Micmac as well. What seems to lead Dr. Speck to call the Penobscot system totemism, is the fact that the Penobscot were divided into bands which as a rule had animal names. Now this is precisely what the Micmac had, notwithstanding the fact that Dr. Speck states categorically that they did not, although he makes no attempt to justify his utter disregard and flat denial of published statements to the contrary. Professor Ganong, who knows New Brunswick probably as well as anyone living, writes that the Micmac at Restigouche composed the band that bore the name of Salmon and that the present Micmac there are well aware of the fact. An informant of his at the Miramichi whose name he gives, said that the Miramichi country was divided into three bands; those of the Main Southwest Miramichi were the sturgeon band, those of Little Southwest Miramichi were the beaver band, while those of the Northwest had an emblem of a man with a drawn bow.

When one undertakes the study of a people who have to a large extent lost their culture, it is always advisable to consult writers who had an opportunity to observe them before they had been very long under European contact. This Dr. Speck has failed to do, for had he consulted the writer who is best known on the Micmac, he could not possibly have overlooked the fact that the Micmac must have had an organization similar to that which Dr. Speck ascribes to the Penobscot. The author I refer to is Le Clercq who wrote the *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie* and who lived among the Micmac for twelve years during the latter part of the seventeenth century. Le Clercq states that the Indians at Restigouche wore a salmon, those of the Miramichi belonged to a band which had an emblem very similar to a cross, and that all the other bands of Micmac had their particular emblem. The subject is not worth going into further here as I am giving it a full discussion in a memoir which I am at present writing for the Geological Survey of Canada. Besides it has already been fully described by my friend, Professor Ganong, in the

introduction to his most valuable work published as the fifth volume of the publications of that well-known organization "The Champlain Society."

A few more points of Dr. Speck's paper seem to require discussion before I conclude, for they are not self-apparent and may, like the statement of Dr. Speck's already considered, merely express his own opinion. Dr. Speck states that the Micmac came to Newfoundland about two hundred and fifty years ago "by estimate," and from the context we naturally assume that this estimate is based on the size of the hunting territory of the various bands, those of Newfoundland having larger territories than the other Micmac. It is not at all self-evident how he can deduce this. Nor is it entirely probable that the Micmac came there two hundred and fifty years ago; certainly we have every reason to believe that the present Micmac territories in Newfoundland are of a much later date, for Chappel, who questioned the Micmac in the early eighteenth century, found that they stated that they only occupied those territories after the war for American Independence. Dr. Speck should at least explain his method better, for to us it is not clear how he can argue that the Micmac came to Newfoundland two hundred and fifty years ago because their hunting territories are larger than the mainland Micmac, whereas the Penobscot came, according to his statements, from 'territories' which are larger to those which are smaller, though in this case he does not give the date. He seems to make his facts fit his fancy or else he has a very comfortable method indeed which allows him to use his facts in either way he wishes.

Finally, it may be added that Dr. Speck presents in his paper nothing which has not been well known for a long time to the anthropological world (though in places he adds details which do not always agree with previous statements). Morgan, for example, states that the Abnaki had gentes with descent in the male line, which is what Dr. Speck states, although he does not make it clear what he means by descent in the male line for he states that marriage was largely arbitrary and that exogamy did not prevail. Now if he would stop to consider, descent would be both in the male and the female line in that case, for both the parents would belong to the same band—sturgeon for example—and all the children, both male and female, would belong to the sturgeon band.

Lastly, he does not at all prove, as he states he does, that the organization which he describes was the fundamental one for the Algonkin tribes, and that the more elaborate one which we find among some Algonkin tribes was merely due to contact with other people. The facts might

very well be interpreted to mean that the Eastern Algonkin system is a broken-down system which once had exogamous clans. In fact I think most people will agree that that is the more probable explanation; at least it agrees with Morgan's statement which after all cannot be disregarded, especially when it is in line with the facts.

WM. HUBBS-MECHLING

EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD

NOTE ON LOEWENTHAL'S "DER HEILBRINGER IN DER IROKESISCHEN
UND DER ALGONKINISCHEN RELIGION."¹

In the first part of *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* for 1913, pp. 65-82, Dr. John Loewenthal has an extensive article with the above title. The undersigned feel that Herr Loewenthal should be highly commended for his diligence as shown by his very great command of the literature on the subject. At the same time the Iroquoian and Algonquian etymologies given are practically all wrong. The fundamental error has been that the writer has seized on this and that morphological element to bolster his case without due consideration whether such elements can occur in the positions desired, or whether synthesis of such elements holds good universally. In point of fact, though both Iroquoian and Algonquian may be analytically reduced to the constituent grammatical elements, yet synthesis of such elements is restricted, not free.

TRUMAN MICHELSON,
J. N. B. HEWITT.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

¹ Printed with permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.